the First Member of Council was once pleased to promise that this principle would be given effect to ?

**General Secretary to Government.**—If a promise like that has been made, it will be acted upon.

**Mr. H. B. Gundappa.**—Are the Government aware that only a very small number of teachers' and inspectors' appointments are held by members of backward communities ?

**Director of Public Instruction.**—The position is slowly improving. The main difficulty is that the higher appointments are given only to men who are in particular grades. Many of such men happen to be Brahmins, and members of backward communities are in lower grades.

**Mr. H. B. Gundappa.**—Why not show special preference to members of backward communities even though they are in lower grades, provided they have the requisite qualifications ?

**Director of Public Instruction.**—That is a matter for Government to consider.

**A Member.**—Would it not be desirable to post as assistant inspectors a larger number of men belonging to backward communities, if necessary, selecting them from among assistant masters of high schools ?

**Director of Public Instruction.**—There will be no insuperable difficulty in doing so. But then the representation in high schools will materially come down.

**Mr. S. C. Mallaiya.**—How is it that there are very few middle school head masters belonging to the non-Brahmin communities ?

**Director of Public Instruction.**—These men are selected according to seniority. Because an assistant master happens to have qualifications, it may not be reasonable to make him supersede all those above him.

**Mr. S. C. Mallaiya.**—It may be that the scales of salaries in one school may be lower than those in others. In such cases, why should non-Brahmins getting the maximum in the former case not be specially selected for appointment to the latter ?

**Director of Public Instruction.**—As far as possible we shall consider that suggestion.

## GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

### 1. Statement of General Principles of the Mysore Road Traffic and Taxes Bill.

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

In October 1932, the Government appointed a Committee with Sir Charles Todhunter as President, to enquire into the matter of the regulation and taxation of motor transport. The Committee submitted their report and made detailed recommendations. The Government have considered their recommendations and propose to introduce a Bill entitled "The Mysore Road Traffic and Taxes Bill" to give effect to such of the recommendations of the Committee as have been accepted by Government and cannot be brought into force under the existing Regulations and Rules. The general principles of the Bill are as detailed below :—

1. The Bill will empower the Government to create a central co-ordinating and licensing authority, called the Traffic Board, consisting of official and non-official members, the latter including a representative of each of the motor bus-owners, other owners of motor conveyances, agricultural interests and commercial interests. The Chairman of the Board will be appointed by the Government.

The Board will be the central authority under the Government to administer generally the Motor Vehicles Regulation and the Road Traffic and Taxes Regulation and the Rules under them and to license motor vehicles in accordance with rules to be prescribed by the Government. The Board will also have the power to hold enquiries in cases of accidents of a serious nature connected with motor vehicles.

2. An obligation will be laid on private lorries also to obtain permits which will be granted subject to conditions and limitations prescribed by rules

3. The existing District Board toll-gates will be taken over to Government control and power will be taken to establish and work new toll-gates on District Board roads as and when required by the Government. Section 66 of the District Boards Regulation empowering District Boards to establish toll-gates on their roads will be repealed.

4. Compensation will be made to the District Boards for loss of toll revenue on the basis of the average collections of tolls for the previous three years. This calculation will be subject to revision at the end of three years.

**Taxation.**

5. *Private Vehicles.*—The scheme of taxation of motor vehicles provided for in the Bill is as follows :—

(*i*) All motor-bicycles, tricycles and cars other than those usually let or plied for hire will be subject to a "vehicle tax," not exceeding the maxima prescribed in Schedule I-A attached hereto. This tax is analogous to the municipal vehicle tax now imposed in the Cities of Bangalore and Mysore. The power of the municipalities to impose a tax on motor vehicles will be withdrawn. The vehicles liable to the vehicle tax are exempt from tolls of the municipality at which the owner is residing, or in the case of cars of owners living outside municipal limits, from tolls of the municipality nearest to their place of residence.

(*ii*) The vehicles mentioned in (*i*) above will be subject to tolls other than those from which they are exempt under (*i*) above ; but it will be open to owners to get exemption from all tolls by an optional payment of "composition fee" based on unladen weight, which shall not exceed the maxima specified in Schedule I-B.

(*iii*) Lorries in the State will not be subject to vehicle tax but will be liable to a road tax at rates not exceeding those specified in Schedule I-C. Lorries will not be subject to tolls in a permitted area or to annual registration.

6. *Public Service Vehicles.*—(*i*) In the case of taxi cars or taxies, a "service tax," *i.e.*, a tax for the privilege of plying for hire, based on seating capacity, is leviable at rates not exceeding those laid down in Schedule I-D. They will not be subject to vehicle tax nor to tolls of the municipality at which the owner resides. They are, however, liable to tolls at all other places or, at their option to a composition fee in lieu of tolls, at the same rates as for private cars. (*Vide* Schedule I-B).

(*ii*) Public service buses plying in purely city areas will be subject to a service tax based on seating capacity at rates not exceeding the maxima specified in Schedule I-D. They will not be subject to the vehicle tax nor to tolls of the municipality at which the owner resides.

(*iii*) Public service buses regularly plying on fixed routes in rural areas will be liable to a service tax, based on seating capacity at rates not exceeding the maxima specified in Schedule I-D. They will pay, in addition, a mileage cess at pies 6 per mile. They will not be subject to vehicle tax and will be free of all tolls.

Double the rates of mileage cess now in force on "railway competition" roads will be abolished and the State Railway will be given the exclusive option of running bus services on roads which run parallel to and close to the railway, subject to the same conditions and taxes as other buses.

(*iv*) Public service lorries will be liable to pay one and a half times the road tax that a private lorry is liable to pay. They will not be subject to vehicle tax and are exempt from tolls in the licensed area, except on railway competition roads whereon the right to levy tolls will be reserved and exercised, if found necessary.

7. Municipalities will be compensated for the loss of vehicle taxes and the *quantum* will be based on their average collections for the previous three years, subject to revision at the end of three years. Out of the proceeds of the mileage cess, and the composition fee in lieu of tolls, District Boards and such of the municipalities as may be notified by the Government, may be

given contributions in such manner as may be determined by the Government.

8. Power will be taken by the Government to make total exemption or other modification in regard to taxes payable—

(*a*) by any person or class of persons ;

(*b*) in respect of any motor vehicle or class of vehicles.

9. Motor vehicles used solely for agricultural purposes are not liable to any of the above taxes; but a motor vehicle used for transporting agricultural produce will not be a vehicle used solely for agricultural purposes.

10. The schedule of tolls will be revised and higher rate of tolls than at present will be prescribed for lorries and for carts carrying timber, stones, etc. A lower rate of tolls will be levied on carts with tyres more than $2\frac{1}{2}''$ wide.

*N.B.*—At present, double bullock carts of agriculturists are liable to a toll of four annas for laden carts and two annas for empty carts—

(i) at all frontier toll-gates ;
(ii) at all District Board toll-gates of some districts ;
(iii) at all gates when carrying commercial timber.

Under the rules to be framed by them, the Government intend introducing a lower uniform rate of tolls at all toll-gates, Provincial and District Board, as follows :—

| | Rs. | a. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|
| (1) On every cart or other vehicle drawn by two bullocks, (buffaloes, horses, ponies, asses or mules) if laden with goods other than timber ... | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| (2) On every cart or other vehicle drawn by two bullocks, (buffaloes, horses, ponies, asses or mules) if laden with timber and stones | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| (3) On every cart or other vehicle drawn by two bullocks, (buffaloes, horses, ponies, asses or mules) if not laden | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Half the above rates are leviable on bullock carts with tyres over $2\frac{1}{2}''$ wide.

The existing concession of the carts of agriculturists being exempt from tolls at any toll-gate situated within a radius of five miles of their homes will be continued.

11. The exemption from tolls in all the cases above referred to applies to those levied at ordinary toll-gates for maintenance. Provision will, however, be made for the levy of *ad hoc* tolls on all vehicles, whenever necessary, for a term of years, when a special facility such as a new bridge, a new road, etc., is provided.

12. Government will be empowered to make rules for carrying out all or any of the purposes of this Regulation.

SCHEDULE I—A.

**Vehicle Tax.**

| | | | Yearly |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | For every motor cycle ... ... ... | Rs. | 15 |
| 2. | For every motor car weighing less than 15 cwt. ... | „ | 30 |
| 3. | For every motor car weighing 15 cwt. or more ... | „ | 40 |
| 4. | For every private motor vehicle adapted to carry 8 persons or more ... ... ... ... | „ | 60 |
| 5. | For every motor or bus used by hotels, schools, etc., only for their clientele for *bona fide* purposes connected with their work, within municipal limits. ... | „ | 100 |
| 6. | For every heavy motor vehicle (*i.e.*, exceeding two tons in weight, unladen) ... ... ... | „ | 100 |

SCHEDULE I—B.

**Composition of Toll—(Optional).**

| Class of vehicles | Annual tax | |
|---|---|---|
| | For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres | For other vehicles |
| | Rs. | Rs. |
| 1. Motor cycles and tricycles including motor scooters and cycles with attachment for propelling the same by mechanical power not exceeding 8 cwt. unladen :— | | |
| (i) Bicycles ... ... ... | 30 | 40 |
| (ii) Bicycles, if used for drawing a trailer or side-car. | 40 | 50 |
| (iii) Tricycles ... ... ... | 40 | 50 |
| 2. Motor vehicles for passengers :— | | |
| (*a*) Weighing not more than 15 cwt., unladen | 70 | 100 |
| (*b*) Weighing more than 15 cwt., but not more than 30 cwt., unladen. | 100 | 150 |
| (*c*) Weighing more than 30 cwt., but not more than 45 cwt., unladen. | 130 | 200 |
| (*d*) Weighing more than 45 cwt., but not more than 60 cwt., unladen. | 160 | 240 |
| (*e*) Weighing more than 60 cwt., unladen ... | 200 | 300 |
| (*f*) Additional tax payable in respect of such vehicles when used for drawing trailers :— | | |
| (i) For each trailer not exceeding 1 ton in weight, unladen. | 40 | 60 |
| (ii) For each trailer exceeding 1 ton in weight, unladen. | 80 | 120 |
| Provided that two or more vehicles shall not be chargeable under this class in respect of the same trailer. | | |

SCHEDULE I—C.

**Road Tax—(Compulsory).**

| Class of vehicles | Quarterly tax | |
|---|---|---|
| | For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres | For other vehicles |
| | Rs. | Rs. |
| Motor vehicles used in the course of trade and industry for the transport or haulage of goods or materials, including tricycles weighing more than 8 cwt., unladen :— | | |
| (*a*) Vehicles not exceeding 15 cwt. in weight, unladen. | 30 | 45 |
| (*b*) Vehicles exceeding 15 cwt., but not exceeding 25 cwt. in weight, unladen. | 50 | 70 |
| (*c*) Vehicles exceeding 25 cwt., but not exceeding 30 cwt. in weight, unladen. | 70 | 90 |
| (*d*) Vehicles exceeding 30 cwt., but not exceeding 35 cwt. in weight, unladen. | 90 | 115 |
| (*e*) Vehicles exceeding 35 cwt., but not exceeding 50 cwt. in weight, unladen. | 112½ | 150 |
| (*f*) Vehicles exceeding 50 cwt., but not exceeding 70 cwt. in weight, unladen. | 150 | 185 |
| (*g*) Vehicles exceeding 70 cwt., but not exceeding 100 cwt. in weight, unladen. | 175 | 225 |
| (*h*) Additional tax payable in respect of such vehicles when used for drawing trailers— | | |
| (i) For each trailer not exceeding 1 ton in weight, unladen. | 60 | 85 |
| (ii) For each trailer exceeding 1 ton in weight, unladen. | 125 | 160 |
| Provided that two or more vehicles shall not be chargeable under this class in respect of the same trailer. | | |

SCHEDULE I—D.

**Service Tax for Public Service Vehicles.**

| *Motor vehicles plying for hire and used for the transport of passengers.* | *Quarterly Tax* | |
|---|---|---|
| | *For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres.* | *For other vehicles.* |
| (*a*) Vehicles licensed to carry in all not more than four persons. | 40 | 60 |
| (*b*) Vehicles licensed to carry more than four persons—for every person which the vehicle is so licensed to carry. | 10 | 15 |

*N.B.*—One seat for the Driver in the case of Motor Taxies and two seats for the Driver and Conductor in the case of Public Service Motor Buses are excluded for the purposes of this tax.

MR. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA was of opinion that District Boards would stand to lose by the proposed constitution of a central traffic controlling agency. The compensation which the Government proposed to make to District Boards would be based upon the average collections for the three years preceding the constitution of such an agency. This presumed that the Government would take into consideration the income for the past years and not provide for an increased share in view of future developments. A District Board under the present arrangement was sure to derive all the benefits of future improvements, such as construction of a new bridge, opening of additional toll-gates, etc., whereas in future the Government would carry away the bulk of the benefits of such improvements.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that so long as the Regulation provided for the revision of the *quantum* of compensation once in three years, the District Boards need have no misgivings about Government giving a reasonable share of the total revenue.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA thanked the Government for bringing up the measure under discussion. Bus traffic had increased enormously throughout the State and the question of road maintenance on this account had assumed considerable importance. The time had come for the Government to control bus traffic and also to find the money required to keep the several roads in a condition fit for heavy traffic. He was glad that the proposed measure would prevent unhealthy competition with railways for which bus-owners were mainly responsible. It was necessary to check such competition in view of the fact that Government had invested huge sums of money — partly borrowed — on the railways, and it was the duty of the Government to see that the railways did not suffer losses on account of the bus competition.

With reference to the detailed provisions of the Bill, the speaker did not favour the proposal to give any share of toll income to the municipalities. He was of opinion that municipalities not having contributed anything to encourage bus traffic or to maintain through roads, they were not entitled to any share of that revenue. He knew of instances of very big municipalities in British India carrying out their work without levying any tolls at all on agricultural carts. In fact in some of them, the system of tolls was altogether unknown. Such being the case, in Mysore, even small municipalities levied heavy tolls on agricultural carts. This, if at all, was a case against the grant of any share to them of the income from tolls under the proposed arrangement. He suggested that the central authority to be constituted should be specially instructed to see that agricultural carts throughout the State were exempted from tolls.

Proceeding, the member referred to the fee leviable on public service vehicles and said that the fee of Rs. 40 per seat per quarter was too high. He did not think that bus-owners had made profits in any case. That was due partly to unhealthy competition to which reference was already made and partly to the heavy expenses they had to incur on account of petrol, tolls, repairs and renewals, establishment, etc.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that all these were duly considered in fixing the rates mentioned in the schedule. And he also thought that losses incurred by bus-owners were due to cut-throat competition. Such competition would be prevented by a central Traffic Board.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA concluded with the suggestion that strict vigilance should be exercised in regard to timings, speed, etc., as police stations did not always have correct time-pieces or clocks, and whenever a bus arrived the traffic constable would only present the register and take signature of the conductor or the driver without verifying the time of arrival and calculating the speed, etc.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that all these matters would come in for scrutiny if once a central Traffic Board was brought into existence.

MR. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA commenced by saying that in respect of

both short distance traffic and long distance traffic the bus-owners were obliged to keep not only the number of buses required for actual use but also one or two spare buses. Under the rules they had to pay the prescribed rate of taxes and tolls on all of them. That meant while the income they derived was only from those buses actually in use, the expenditure on account of taxes, etc., had to be incurred on all of them including the spare ones. This in itself was a source of loss to them. Under the proposed measure the bigger buses were going to be taxed almost prohibitively. At this rate he feared that the bus traffic throughout the State would suffer a severe set-back.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL, however, did not agree in this view and invited the attention of the speaker to the fact that there would not be so many applications for licenses to ply for hire if the bus industry as a whole was subjected to severe losses.

MR. CHANNABASAPPA then said that the difficulties might not be felt so keenly in respect of long distance traffic; but the bulk of the bus services in the State related to short distances and it was in such cases that bus-owners stood to lose very heavily under the proposed measure.

With regard to the quarterly taxes payable on public service vehicles, the member said that the Bill did not clearly state whether the license would permit of the buses plying in any part of the State once the tax was paid or whether such permit would be confined to the particular district to which it belonged.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the buses would be allowed to ply wherever necessary by paying the mileage cess.

With regard to the exemption allowed to vehicles employed solely for agricultural purposes, MR. CHANNABASAPPA brought to notice that this benefit was not actually being enjoyed by the ignorant raiyats, due to obstructions of all kinds. In the first place, the raiyats in order to be entitled to such exemption were expected to obtain either from the chairman of the concerned village panchayat or from the patel of the village a certificate to the effect that the village was within a radius of 5 miles from the toll-gate. It was not always possible for the raiyat to get at either of them to obtain such a certificate; and sometimes, due to party factions, particular individuals might not be able to obtain the same. In any event, the raiyats were unable to press their claim for exemption. Secondly, even granting that every time the required certificate was obtained, the raiyats were not always able to satisfy either the toll-gate contractor or his employees about their claim for exemption; and the toll-gate contractors, being men of considerable influence, were generally able to enforce payment however much exemption was deserved.

The speaker next observed that the proposed revision of the schedule of tolls in respect of lorries would result in an excessive levy and that the rates that would be charged in future would also be very much more than the present rates.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that heavy lorries which were doing considerable damage to roads were, in the opinion of Government, not bearing their due share of taxation; and in proposing the revised rates the object of Government was to charge them reasonable rates and also to bring about uniformity throughout the State. The higher rates, he said, could also be justified by the circumstance that it was difficult to levy the mileage cess from lorries which often ran on different roads on different days.

MR. CHANNABASAPPA then referred to taxies and said that the taxes proposed in respect of them were very heavy, there being little or no business done by them particularly in the Mysore District. It would be well if Government bore this aspect in mind and lightened the burden of taxation on these as well as on the other public service vehicles. Otherwise any extra burden levied on the bus-owners would be shifted on to the passengers in the

shape of increased fares which they could ill-afford to pay.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL pointed out that it would not be open to bus or taxi owners to increase the fares arbitrarily because that would certainly be a matter for control by the proposed central Traffic Board.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA, in opposing the principles of the Bill, regretted that the statement placed in the hands of members did not clearly explain the disadvantages experienced by the Government or the people under the existing law, or the advantages sought to be created by the proposed measure. He was of opinion that this Bill had been drafted with one sole object in view, *viz.*, to gain additional revenue. In particular, he did not see the justice of a measure which provided for so many toll-gates, more especially in view of the promise held out by the Government definitely in the past to the effect that all toll-gates in the State would be abolished if Mysore really got its share of the petrol tax income from the Government of India.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL reminded the speaker that he had said time and again that no such promise was ever held out by the Government nor was there any connection whatever between the toll-gates and petrol tax income.

Continuing, MR. GUNDAPPA said that country carts, both laden and unladen, should be exempt from the proposed tolls. He did not very much object to the levy on carts conveying timber; but as regards carts carrying country stone slabs, he earnestly pleaded for exemption for the reason that for all his trouble the seller might not make a profit of more than a few annas per cart.

The speaker referred in this connection to a definite statement made by the present Second Member of Council when he was Revenue Commissioner, as chairman of a Tolls Committee of which he, the speaker, happened to be a member, to the effect that even though buses and lorries would in future be subjected to special taxes, country carts throughout the State would have to be exempted from payment of any toll whatever. He requested that at least this promise be given effect to.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the inquiry and report of the committee referred to had proceeded on a different basis altogether, the underlying principle then being the total abolition of toll-gates. On receipt of the report of that committee the Government found that there would be considerable difficulty in totally abolishing toll-gates. That was why the entire scheme had to be given up. It was not a question then of abolishing tolls on country carts merely but one of abolition of toll-gates altogether. Subsequently the entire question was referred to a new committee consisting of both officials and non-officials, and that committee had examined it afresh and submitted exhaustive proposals to Government.

MR. GUNDAPPA then mentioned the instances of District Boards having exempted country carts from tolls even under the existing practice and requested the Government to extend the same concession throughout the State under the proposed Bill.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL enquired whether the Hassan District Board of which the speaker was the President, had extended the concession to country carts in that district.

MR. GUNDAPPA answered in the negative but observed that 5 other District Boards had done it; and he added that unless a general exemption was provided for under the proposed measure, even such districts might revive the tolls, which would not be justified at any rate in the present period of economic depression. The proposed measure appeared to give power to the Government not only to levy tolls on country carts and other vehicles at the existing gates but even to open additional toll-gates at their own option. If this was done, it would amount to a total withdrawal of the powers and privileges already enjoyed by District Boards.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL reminded the member that even if additional toll-gates were going to be

opened, it would not be done unless both the official and non-official members on the proposed Central Board agreed to it.

MR. GUNDAPPA feared that the non-official members might not come from all the 8 districts of the State.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that even if it were so, there was nothing to prevent the Board from consulting all the districts. If that was done, the existing confusion and conflict between district and district in the matter of apportionment of toll revenue would be effectively avoided.

MR. GUNDAPPA observed that this did not appear to him as a very difficult issue and that even if conflicts arose, the District Boards could easily adjust them among themselves.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL thought, that that was not so easy as the member seemed to think, because there was no uniformity of procedure relating to levy of tolls, *e.g.*, District Boards had adopted the 24-hour rule while some others had the 'sun-rise to sun-set rule.' In this view, he said that the appointment of a central controlling authority was very desirable.

With regard to the provision made for compensation to District Boards for loss of toll revenue and revision of calculation of the amount payable once in 3 years, MR. GUNDAPPA wanted to know whether the average figure would be calculated at the end of 3 years after the introduction of the proposed Regulation or immediately, on the basis of the figures for 3 years preceding it.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the latter would be the case.

MR. GUNDAPPA was not certain that credit would be given to District Boards for any new gates opened or for improvements effected subsequent to the introduction of the Regulation.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL answered that this could be done. He added that District Boards need not worry themselves about such details so long as the Government gave the definite assurance that all income from this source was going to be earmarked for improvement of roads exclusively.

MR. GUNDAPPA, however, felt that the benefit of improvements in a particular district might not all come to the same district.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL assured the speaker that if the proposed legislation was introduced, the whole arrangement of tolls would be re-examined and a re-shuffling effected, and that even without reference to such reshuffling of gates the Government were going to guarantee to the District Boards the income they were actually getting at present.

MR. GUNDAPPA stressed the point that the districts might not get the benefit of future improvements. Besides, the only two important sources of revenue of District Boards were Market fees and Toll-gate fees: and if one of these two main items, *viz.*, toll income, was taken away from them, the finances of the District Boards would be seriously crippled and the whole system of local self-government in Mysore would suffer a serious set-back.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the sole object underlying the proposed measure was to put toll-gates on a provincial basis and that unless one central authority took charge of them, the regulation of fast moving traffic would not be possible.

MR. GUNDAPPA remarked that the Government always seemed solicitous to the interests of the upper classes and often lost sight of the poor villager. In conclusion, he said that the present time was least opportune for the introduction of a measure like the one now proposed.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA, in opposing the principles of the measure under discussion, suggested that the proposed Central Board should consist of not only a non-official majority but also of elected representatives of each District Board as also representatives of bus-owners' associations to be formed in each district. He added that the rates now proposed should be reduced by 50 per cent in all cases. He also suggested that tolls should be abolished altogether in respect of bullock carts. The 5-mile rule was not at all working at present and toll-gate contractors were

levying tolls from bullock carts because it was not possible for the villagers always to get the prescribed certificate from the concerned patel or village panchayat chairman.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL enquired whether this difficulty would be obviated if the toll-gates were worked departmentally.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA replied that even that would be followed by many practical difficulties.

Continuing, the speaker made the following suggestions :—

(1) A special provision should be made for giving refunds in respect of buses and lorries which might be put out of service by sustaining accidents or be under repairs.

(2) In the case of public service buses with a seating capacity in excess of the seats actually provided at the time of registration or licensing, the certificate to be issued and the taxes to be levied should have reference to the actual number of seats permitted.

(3) In the case of public service vehicles plying in the malnad, due margin should be made for extra wear and tear on account of the bad condition of roads there.

(4) The Central Traffic Controlling Board should be given discretion to offer special inducements or concessions for opening of services on roads on which the facility did not exist at present.

In conclusion, the member observed that if toll-gates were taken out of the control of District Boards, there might not be work enough for the Boards themselves and the need for separate non-official Presidents and Vice-Presidents would no longer exist.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY, who next spoke, supported the principles of the measure in general. He said that in many respects the Bill sought to effect improvements over the existing law. As a member of the committee on whose recommendations the Bill under reference was based, he briefly narrated the history of the constitution of the committee and its deliberations at various stages. While agreeing to all the provisions relating to motor cars and other vehicles, he said that both in the committee and elsewhere he was strongly opposed to the levy of tolls on bullock carts whatever the goods they carried. He did not know why the committee or the Government should make any difference between a bullock cart carrying stone slabs and a cart carrying any other stuff ; because, irrespective of the article conveyed, the load per cart would always have regard to the total weight that the animals could pull. In this view, he did not support the idea of levying any higher toll from bullock carts conveying particular articles like timber or stone slabs. He would also not make a distinction in the levy with reference to the width of the tyres of the vehicle.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL thought that there did not seem to be much point in members asking for exemption to country carts carrying timber from payment of tolls. If it was true that the goods conveyed were meant to be sold, it would follow that any tolls paid thereon would be transferred to the purchaser so that the owner of the transport would not suffer any loss merely because of the tolls.

MR. PUTTASWAMY said that that would appear to be so in theory but in point of fact, the seller who was still ignorant in the majority of cases, blindly depended upon commission agents in the cities and was prepared to sell the articles for whatever price the commission agent fixed without calculating his own expenses so that in effect the toll and such other incidental expenses would often have to be borne by himself. In this view, he pleaded for exempting such carts from the provincial tolls.

In this connection, he observed that the proposed measure sought to exempt only carts used for purely agricultural purposes from the levy of tolls ; whereas, the practice at present was to exempt all carts from the levy, at any rate within a radius of five miles from the toll-gate. He was anxious that this privilege should be continued even under the proposed legislation.

MR. PUTTASWAMY then referred to

the provision relating to compensating local boards for loss of vehicle taxes and observed that even though there was provision for revising the average figure once in three years, the local boards would forego, till the commencement of a succeeding triennium, the benefit of improvements effected or new gates opened in the meantime.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that it might be possible for Government to arrive at an equitable arrangement with the local bodies on the question of average collections.

In conclusion, MR. PUTTASWAMY said that he would lend his whole-hearted support to the Bill if the Government conceded his two main points, *viz.*, adoption of a proper principle with regard to the proportionate share of income to be given to local boards and general exemption to bullock carts from tolls.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA opposed the general principles for the reason that public interests were not going to be served by the proposed measure. Its only effect would be to add to the burden of taxation which already was heavy, without any corresponding advantages either to the District Boards or to the general public. So far as he understood the position of the Government, the main object underlying the proposed Bill was to establish uniformity of procedure. To secure that one object, he thought, it was really not worth while introducing such an elaborate Regulation; because the object could as well be secured by making suitable changes in the existing law, with regard to both the amount of taxes leviable as also the period of exemption in view of payment made at any one time of the day. He also repeated the arguments advanced by previous speakers to the effect that local boards stood to lose by the Central Board taking power over the provincialised toll system. At present, the District Boards had exempted country carts from the tolls whereas, under the proposed legislation, Government would take power to re-impose the toll. This was not at all desirable considering the present economic condition of the agriculturists.

He also pleaded for doing away with the distinction as between carts used for agricultural purposes and carts conveying agricultural produce to markets. Because, it was only by selling the agricultural crop grown by him that the raiyat would derive the full benefit of his labours and be able to meet all his needs.

As regards taxes on buses, he said that the rates proposed in the Bill were higher than those in Madras.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL reminded the speaker that the rates provided were only the maximum rates.

MR. MALLAPPA however thought that once the maximum rate was prescribed, the tendency generally would be to make full use of it.

The bus-owners had very many difficulties even at present and would practically be ruined if the existing rates were enhanced even slightly. The unemployment problem, serious as it was already, would become much more so if the bus service was dislocated. At the same time, it was necessary for the Government to remember that any enhancement of taxation would be naturally followed by enhancement of fares which the general travelling public could certainly not afford at the present time. He was not prepared to believe that the Government were really unaware of all these consequences of enhanced taxation. On the contrary, he suspected that it might even be that the Government wanted deliberately to discourage the bus industry in all possible ways with a view to see that the railways made better profits.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL regretted that that did not amount to a correct understanding of the situation by the speaker. If that were the only object of Government or even their main object, an elaborate legislation of the kind under discussion was really not necessary. The object was, as was stated a number of times, to bring into existence a central authority to take charge of fast moving traffic throughout the State. Even granting for the purpose of argument that one of the objects was to see that the railways did not suffer losses, he did not know why such an object should be objected to.

The railways were a public property, a national asset, and it was the duty of one and all to see that they suffered no losses. Besides, the principle of co-ordinating the railway and bus services had been tried in other administrations with considerable success and Government were proposing to do so in Mysore also.

*At this stage, the Assembly rose for lunch and met again at 3-30 p.m.*

With reference to the statement of the First Member of Council that railways were in a sense public property and that by the Railway Department itself running buses on what are now known as railway competition roads the people at large would stand to benefit, MR. D. S. MALLAPPA contended that in the same sense buses also were public property and had a direct bearing on the prosperity of the people, establishing as they did a direct link between commercial centres and the interior parts of the State. In spite of the heavy rates paid by bus-owners on railway competition routes they were able to eke out a living by the small profits made on the service as a whole. By levying any higher rates than at present, they would be thrown out of the industry altogether and this would have the effect of aggravating the unemployment problem. After all, he did not see why the Government should be so particular about putting an end to competition as between railways and buses. Personally he was of opinion that the railways also would pay due regard to efficient service if there was the fear of competition from buses. Apart from that it was a fact that buses were able to provide to the general public comforts which the railways could not. And when they were serving such a useful purpose, it was not fair that the bus-owners should be prevented from keeping up the industry and finding their own livelihood.

Speaking of conveniences provided by public service vehicles, the member was also reminded of delays, risk of loss including leakage, etc., which private parties were put to in the case of getting goods by rail, which did not happen if the same were obtained through lorries. Even over long distances, the parties were able to convey goods in a very much shorter time than it was generally possible to convey them by rail. In other words, the public would be put to inconvenience if they had to depend only on railways for this purpose, and this would be all the more so if the railways had not even the fear of bus competition.

As regards the proposal to give contributions to municipalities out of the proceeds of the mileage cess, the member observed that it was not perhaps necessary to see that any and every municipality would be entitled to such contribution, because in his opinion some of the municipalities might not at present be levying any vehicle tax at all. Even as between municipalities which were levying this tax a perusal of paragraphs 5 and 7 of the statement of general principles would indicate that Government propose to give a higher proportion of contribution particularly to the municipalities of Bangalore and Mysore, because they levied a vehicle tax. He hoped that Government were not under the impression that there were no other municipalities similarly levying this tax.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the cases of all such municipalities would certainly come in for consideration. The only object of Government in making the provision under reference was to levy a State tax at a uniform rate.

MR. MALLAPPA said that it might not be very fair to levy a uniform rate on vehicles belonging to urban and rural areas because business conditions in the rural parts were certainly not the same as those in the urban areas.

With regard to paragraphs 9 and 10 of the statement of general principles, MR. MALLAPPA said that the carts in the rural parts would have to pay much larger sums by way of tolls. To this the member was opposed. He was similarly opposed to the levy of *ad hoc* tolls on vehicles merely because any special facilities were provided. The bus-owners were not able to bear any additional burden of taxation.

Karnataka State Archives Library



ಕನ್ನಡ ಪುಟ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಅಭಿಲೇಖಾಗಾರ
ಬಾ ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ
ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ Accession No(s) 4675
ದಿನಾಂಕ Date

The District Boards seemed to have a grievance that the State was not making over to them any portion of the revenue derived from petrol tax and they were also not aware which roads particularly would get the benefit of that income. Such being the case, it would be inadvisable for the Government to introduce the proposed measure which would tax the people unnecessarily. The State, on the other hand, would benefit by all possible encouragement to bus traffic.

In conclusion, MR. MALLAPPA said that the measure did not deserve to be supported from any point of view—the interests of the people, the interests of the District Boards and the interests of bus-owners. The existing orders of Government and the arrangements with regard to bus traffic seemed to him quite adequate, but if Government thought that they required modifications or improvements in any particular respects, it was up to them to suggest such modifications or improvements instead of introducing a legislation whose effect on the people at large would be adverse.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH, in opposing the principles of the measure under reference, traced the history of the increasing burden devolving upon bus-owners on account of taxation, etc., and of their agitation for relief, and said that even though Government had promised some kind of relief time and again in connection with the reports submitted by more than one committee specially appointed by them, no such relief had been afforded in the past; under the proposed measure the burden was only sought to be still further added to. So far as the proposed measure was concerned, he was anxious that one central fact should be borne in mind by all concerned, *viz.*, that the bus services had largely contributed to the progress of the State in establishing a direct contact between the cities and towns and villages. On this one account alone, they deserved every approbation and encouragement at the hands of the Government. But unfortunately, the Government did not seem to take a sympathetic view of the matter. He appealed for a proper understanding of the situation by the Government as well as the Assembly and for a thorough re-examination of the place of private bus-owners in the economic polity of the State.

With regard to the details of the proposed measure, the speaker referred to the provision in respect of abolition of bus services on the railway competition roads and said that in declaring such roads a monopoly of the Railway Department, Government were certain to lose the large income which they were now obtaining from the extra taxes levied on the bus services on such roads. In view of this certain loss of revenue, he would suggest that in future, even the maintenance of such roads should be declared an essential duty of the Railway Department and that the Government should not spend on such roads any part of their income from tolls and taxes on vehicles. But apart from the question of road maintenance, he would go so far as to say that this very idea of giving a monopoly to the Railway Department over such roads was never made known to bus-owners and that by giving effect to this proposal, the Government would be unjustly putting the bus-owners to a loss from the effects of which they could never recover, more especially because they had been encouraged from time to time to sink large sums of money on buses, very often borrowed, and were given no indication of what Government were ultimately going to do in the matter.

Continuing, MR. SANJEEVIAH said that he was glad that vehicles used solely for agricultural purposes were not proposed to be taxed, but he was sorry that transportation of agricultural produce was not going to be recognised as an agricultural purpose. This he thought was an instance to show the absence of a proper perspective on the part of the drafters of the Bill. So long as the growing of crops was recognised as an agricultural operation, the disposal of such crops had in reason to be recognised as an agricultural purpose and as such there was no meaning, he said, in

levying tax on vehicles conveying such agricultural produce.

Several provisions of the Bill related to additional taxation and the Bill as a whole appeared to be a fiscal measure. Under the constitution in force, the Government were obliged to obtain the consent of both the Constitutional Houses before introducing any fiscal measure. In this view it did not seem to him that Government had done the right thing in proposing this Bill without the express approval of both the Houses.

It was usual for the Government to refer to the practice obtaining in the British Indian Presidencies whenever the Assembly or the Council offered opposition to a measure proposed by Government. He did not know why the Government had not done so in this particular case. Personally he was aware that the system of tolls and taxes on vehicles in Madras was more favourable than even the existing practice in Mysore and very much more so than in the proposed measure. For these reasons, he appealed to Government to withdraw the Bill.

MR. HOSKOPPA KRISHNA RAO prefaced his remarks by saying that the present was a most inopportune time to introduce the proposed Bill. The economic position of the bus-owners, like that of others, was at the lowest ebb and they could not bear the burden of additional taxation which seemed to be the sole object underlying the measure.

The member referred to the great discontent that prevailed among the bus-owners some time ago when the taxes on vehicular traffic were enhanced. Government then appeared to sympathise with the bus-owners who exhibited their discontent in many ways. The appointment of the committee whose recommendations had been embodied in the Bill under discussion was the result of a realisation on the part of the Government of the justice of the cause of bus-owners. Unfortunately, however, it was not possible for members of the Assembly to ascertain all the reasons that led to the particular recommendations of the committee. However there might be no difference of opinion between the Government and the Assembly in that uniformity should be brought about in respect of taxation on public service vehicles in the several parts of the State. But still, this being in the main a financial measure, it was worth while giving time to the general public to consider all the implications of the Bill instead of rushing it through.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL objected to the member characterising the procedure in this case as rushing through, because the Assembly had been informed of the introduction of a Bill of the kind at its previous session; if the same was not actually taken up at that session, it was because that Government thought that both themselves and the public at large required time to consider it in all its aspects.

MR. HOSKOPPA KRISHNA RAO observed that if that were so, it would have been much better if the Government had placed the Bill itself in the hands of the members as was done in a few cases in the past in respect of the more important measures, and not merely the statement of its general principles. He also added that apart from the question of procedure, the Bill, if brought into effect, would result in additional taxation which people in Mysore could ill-afford to submit themselves to at the present time.

Time and again, people had represented that tolls were acting as a great hardship on them and that they should be abolished. An impression had been created by Government that they would abolish the tolls if they received their share of the petrol tax revenue from the Government of India. This they had begun to receive, but instead of proposing the abolition of the toll-gates, Government were now proposing to materially enhance the burden on the people. This he observed was very unjust. In order to make out a case in this behalf and also to correctly appreciate the full implications of the measure, the members of the House certainly required some time. For these reasons, he earnestly requested the Government to withdraw the Bill for the present and to place it before the House at its next Session.

KHAN BAHADUR MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN supported the principles of the proposed Bill. He observed that there was no difference of opinion as to the losses which the bus-owners were suffering at present but if there was difference, it was with regard to the way in which a remedy could be found for improving the position. Speaking for himself, he was sure that all these losses were due to the fact that a number of services had been permitted by Government on one and the same road and that the bus-owners had brought about unhealthy competition among themselves. If this was checked in future, he was certain that the interests of bus-owners would no longer suffer. The Central Board would see that a limited number of licenses were issued for buses to ply on particular roads and that all the income derived thereby would be spent for the roads. At present, the bus-owners, in their anxiety to increase their own income, were permitting over-loading of both passengers and luggage. It was this indiscretion on the part of the bus-owners or their employees that led to a number of accidents. If a central authority was brought into being, such things would be effectively stopped. In that event, every interest concerned would be properly safeguarded, *i.e.*, the passengers would have their due comforts, accidents would be avoided, the roads would receive better attention than at present and the bus-owners would no longer have to suffer heavy losses. In addition to these advantages the proposed measure would also help the Government to see that the railways on which very large investments had been made but which were at present not making the anticipated profit would hereafter be enabled to show better results in working. It was to secure all these interests that Government had proposed that the Central Board should include representatives of bus-owners, agriculturists, general non-official public and businessmen, and it was open to the Assembly to suggest the inclusion on this Board of all Presidents of the District Boards also.

In the course of discussions, members had brought to notice that the benefit of the five-mile rule was not actually reaching the owners of many country carts. He was sure that such complaints would not be heard of in future under the proposed legislation. He was glad that in deserving cases, the taxes leviable on vehicles particularly in rural parts would be much more reasonable than at present. He did not agree with some of the members who had expressed the fear that the proposed measure would result in lessening the income of District Boards on account of tolls. On the other hand the District Boards were going to be assured of their present income. From all points of view, he sincerely hoped that the measure deserved the whole-hearted support of the House.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO, in the course of his observations on the statement of general principles, said that he did not expect opposition from any quarter so far as the proposed constitution of a Central Board of Traffic was concerned. As regards the other provisions, he said he was disappointed to find that many essential details appeared to have been lost sight of by the drafters of the Bill, such as for instance the method of providing increased facilities to the general public. He was also unable to find anywhere in the statement a clear indication of the advantages that would accrue from the new legislation, and that almost all the provisions seemed to have as their central aim the making of additional profit for the Government. He would have been glad if the statement had clearly defined the duties and powers of the proposed central authority, the questions which would be outside the purview of the Board, the matters on which Government alone were competent to pass orders and so on. He did not know how the Government expected the Assembly to dispose of the proposed measure on merits without clearing all such necessary issues.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that Government would be glad to include all these matters in the Bill. The powers of the committee would include the consideration of questions like (1) the suitability of the

route or routes for the traffic; (2) the extent to which the needs of the proposed routes were adequately served; (3) the extent to which a proposed service was desirable in public interests; (4) the needs of the area as a whole in relation to traffic; and (5) the co-ordination of all forms of passenger traffic including transport by rail

Proceeding, MR. NARASINGA RAO differed from the view expressed by Khan Bahadur Mahomed Abbas Khan that a majority of accidents that were occurring at present were due to overloading of the buses. He thought that most of the accidents were due to all sorts of buses being permitted to ply and the drivers not always being qualified hands. He also suggested that insurance for third party risks should be provided for.

On this point, the FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that the Todhunter Committee had actually consulted many bus-owners but that the consensus of opinion was that such insurance would involve disproportionately heavy expenditure. But personally he thought that the question whether at least in particular areas insurance for third party risks was not desirable would have to be considered again.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO hoped that Government would decide in favour of such insurance, bearing in mind the fact that the interests of passengers were supreme and that the bus-owners should have to discharge a due sense of responsibility towards the passengers. Otherwise, he thought that the object of the whole scheme of traffic control would be frustrated.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that such compulsory insurance had been introduced in the city of Bombay; the Motor Vehicles Regulation at present in force in Mysore was practically a replica of the law in Bombay, *viz.*, the British Indian Motor Vehicles Act. Under the law in force in Mysore, the Government had been advised that they had the power to insist on insurance for third party risks if it was decided to do so.

With regard to the details concerning the proposed increase in taxation, MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO observed that the increase could not be justified on any ground. The bus-owners had done a great public service in establishing and maintaining contact between the rural and the urban parts of the State. They had contributed in no small measure to the development of trade and commerce and to the progress of the State as a whole. For all that, they deserved the gratitude of the people at large because they were discharging by the people a duty which really belonged to the State. If all the taxation proposals contained in the Bill were really passed, the one direct effect of it would be to discourage the industry and if on that account many of the services were discontinued, the interests of the State would suffer and people in the interior would practically have to revert to mediæval means of communication. At any rate, the bus-owners were sure to raise the fares. In such an event, the main object of the Government, *viz.*, the extension of communications in the interior parts would be frustrated.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that Government were fully conscious of the services rendered by the bus-owners to the general public and had in fact acknowledged it on a number of occasions. It was never their intention therefore to make it impossible for the bus-owners to maintain the services efficiently, and to serve public interests to the best of their ability. At the same time, Government were aware of the adverse effects on the bus-owners due to unhealthy competition. But that was a circumstance for which he feared the bus-owners themselves were responsible. It was to check such cut-throat competition and to save the bus-owners from ruin that the Government had proposed the legislation under discussion. In fact, two years ago, Government, after thoroughly studying the situation, had plainly told the bus-owners that all their sufferings were due to cut-throat competition; that they must no longer give room for it and that Government were prepared to

extend all reasonable help to them in the direction of preventing particular individuals from carrying on such competition. Unfortunately the bus-owners did not co-operate with Government and some of them seemed to be under the impression that such competition would help them to carry on. That was why Government had to step in, take charge of the situation, reduce the number of services, encourage combination and prevent unrestricted competition.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO then referred to the proposal to give power to the Central Board to hold enquiries in cases of accidents, and said that it would be better if the nature of such enquiries had also been defined. At present it was not clear as to whether the Board would have judicial powers also.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the nature of the enquiry would be the same as that of enquiries conducted in the case of railway accidents for example. The power proposed to be given to the Board would certainly not supersede magisterial enquiries.

In conclusion, MR. NARASINGA RAO said that if all the necessary details were provided for and the rule-making powers of the Board were also clearly defined and Government agreed in general to reduce the burden of taxation which the bus-owners were now bearing, the House would see its way to vote for the measure.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR was of opinion that the proposed Bill would create considerable hardship to the bus-owners and to poor passengers. The only effect of the proposed legislation of which people were certain was the throwing of additional burden on passengers on account of the enhancement of the taxes. This would lead in its turn to one of two consequences: firstly, the bus-owners would transfer their additional burden to the passengers, *i.e.*, the fares would be substantially enhanced. This the people could not bear, in their present economic condition; secondly, being unable to pay the enhanced taxes, the bus-owners would probably wind up their business, in a majority of cases at any rate. In either case, people would be denied a facility which they so far had enjoyed and would hereafter have to revert to jutkas and other old time conveyances. Would this make for progress? The Dewan was time and again placing before the people high ideals and exhorting them to follow the example of so many western nations which were progressing from day to day, and if at such a time Government were to compel people to revert to old methods of conveyances, he for one would be unable to find any consistency between the actions and expressions of the Government.

Continuing, MR. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR thought that the enhanced taxation would act as a great hardship particularly in the case of buses plying between short distances.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that at first sight it might appear to be so. But he would ask the speaker to remember that once the prescribed fees were paid, the buses would be free to ply between long distances without having to pay any further tolls. If this were so, the owners of such services would not suffer a loss, because the short distance traffic that the member seemed to be thinking of would only form part of the long journeys performed by the buses.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR did not believe that all the services would be meant for long distances. After all, it was a few well-to-do owners that might undertake long distance services. The bulk of bus-owners were only able to ply for short distances. Such being the case, he feared that the reply of the First Member of Council indicated that the Government were mostly concerned with the interests of large capitalists. That was why he thought that poorer men stood to suffer considerably by passing the proposed legislation. In effect, he would suggest that the heavy tolls proposed in respect of short distance traffic should be lightened. In fact, he would go further and suggest the abolition of all toll-gates. After all, Government were

making one or two lakhs of rupees therefrom and the loss that might be incurred by abolishing these gates would be more than compensated by the receipts from the petrol tax revenue.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that granting, for the sake of argument, that the Government agreed to abolish provincial toll-gates, the District Boards which derived a good part of their income through toll-gates might not agree to abolishing district fund gates.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR requested the Government to make up their mind to abolish provincial toll-gates and hoped that if that was done, the District Boards would also abolish the gates under their control.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL remarked that this did not appear to be practical politics at present.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR, however, did not think so. He concluded with the observation that the proposed Bill appeared to him like an ill wind that did nobody any good. He was sure that the people of the State did not want it and as such he was unable to see the reason why the Government were proposing to introduce it.

*At this stage, the Assembly rose for the day to meet again on Monday, 22nd October 1934.*

---

THIRD DAY.

*Monday, 22nd October 1934.*

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*Contd.*

*Repair of the Breached Tank of Mannigarahalli, Magadi Taluk.*

MR. M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY (Magadi Taluk).—

*Q.*—6. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) Is it a fact that the raiyats have requested that the breached tank of Mannigarahalli Village, Kudur Hobli, Magadi Taluk, should be got repaired ?

(*b*) How many years ago was this report made ?

(*c*) For how many years is the record relating to this tank pending ?

(*d*) (i) Is it a fact that the villagers have asked for the repair of this tank, and (ii) deposited money therefor?

(*e*) When was the money deposited ?

(*f*) What action have Government taken after the money was deposited?

(*g*) Have the Government given any endorsement to the villagers to the effect that the tank would be repaired ?

(*h*) Is it a fact that the plan of the tank has been prepared ?

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—

*A.*—6. (*a*) Yes.

(*b*) About three years ago.

(*c*) Since three years.

(*d*) (i) *Vide* answer to (*a*) above.

(ii) A small amount of Rs. 60 has been deposited.

(*e*) Information not readily available.

(*f*) Project has been prepared.

(*g*) No.

(*h*) Yes.

MR. M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY.—With reference to answer to (*c*) stating that the records relating to this tank are pending since the past three years, may I know on what basis this information has been furnished ?

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—From the office records.

MR. M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY.—Was not this request made so early as the year 1915 and was not a notice given to the villagers by the taluk authorities in C. No. 19, dated 6th December 1915, that the restoration work would be taken up if the villagers agreed to bear one-third of the estimated cost and also deposited an acreage contribution of Rs. 50 in advance ?

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—The answer has been furnished from the available records. The estimate for the work comes to Rs. 9,700 and the raiyats'